

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-29 were pending. Claims 1-29 were rejected. Claims 5 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1-29 are currently pending.

### **Amendment to the Claims**

Claim 5 has been amended by deleting the phrase ", or print resolution of," so as to clarify the scope of claim 5. Claims 26 has been amended by deleting the phrase "reading and" so as to clarify the scope of claim 26. No new matter has been added.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1-12 and 14-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent number 5,890,818 issued to Roland P. SANSONE (hereinafter Sansone).

Sansone discloses a system used to remove fractions of a pixel from bar code bars to maintain the correct distance between adjacent code forming bars (Sansone column 5, lines 11-13). The system includes a computer that stores information about printers, printer settings, inks or toners and papers that have been found to be compatible with the printing of indicia (Sansone column 5, lines 50-53). The system also includes a program to compute and store "simulated" bar and space widths (Sansone column 8, lines 5-6). The program interacts with a bar code quality factors database (Sansone column 8, lines 32-36). This database contains: a printer compatibility list; a printer settings list; a paper compatibility list; a toner and ink compatibility list; bar code definitions; a list of printer growth and shrinkage factors; a paper growth factors list; and a toner and ink growth factors list (Sansone column 8, lines 11-13).

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for generating logo data to be stored in and printed by a printer. The terms used in the claims should be interpreted in light of the applicants' specification. Logo data as described in the applicants' specification on page 2, lines 1-2 is digital image data. The logo data is generated by creating the source data from which the logo is derived (applicants' specification, page 2, lines 30-32). The source data is adjusted according to the characteristics of the printer (applicants' specification, page 2, lines 30-32). The logo data is stored in the

printer and a logo print command can be sent to a printer to read and print the image from memory (applicants' specification, page 2, lines 13-15).

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion that Sansone discloses all of the features recited in claim 1, when taken in light of the applicants' disclosure. In particular, Sansone does not suggest or disclose a system in which the logo data is stored in the printer and used when a logo print command is sent to the printer. Instead Sansone disclose a system for controlling the quality printed barcodes. Sansone does not disclose storing the barcodes in the printer. Nor would someone skilled in the art be motivated to store the barcodes in the printer as described by Sansone because the barcodes as described by Sansone are created on the spot and changed with each use. For at least this reason claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Furthermore, Sansone does not suggest or disclose processing the source data based on the model-specific data as recited in claim 1 on lines 11-13. This should be interpreted in light of the applicants' specification at least on page 2, lines 30-32 and page 10, lines 20-24. Claim 1 recites processing the source data, thus basic image data (source data) is adjusted to fit the limitations of the printer. Whereas, Sansone seek to prevent the bar code form being adjusted by imperfections in the printing process so as to prevent the bar code from being adjusted by the limitations of the printer. Thus claim 1 is diametrically opposed to Sansone's main goal. Sansone does not modify the bar code but instead modifies the printing instructions. The bar code is kept intact and is in fact reproduced more accurately. Sansone is so concerned that the barcode be encoded exactly that he discloses using a feedback system to ensure that the printing process maintains its accuracy. This is an additional reason as to why claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 14 and 20 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 1-13, 15-19 and 21- 25 are allowable at least because they are dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 3. The applicants respectfully suggest that nowhere in the 9 paragraphs cited by the examiner does the Sansone suggest a control data receiving unit adapted to disable

receipt of at least some data for which setting is not required based on previously received or set control data. In fact Sansone does suggest or disclose the disabling the receipt of any data. This is an additional reason as to why claim 3 is allowable over the cited art.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 5. Sansone's disclosure of a toner and ink compatibility list (Sansone, column 5, lines 50-53) is not equivalent to specifying the color available for printing as recited in claim 5. This is an additional reason as to why claim 5 is allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 6. Sansone's disclosure of toner identification, ink identification, information about ink or toner (Sansone, column 5, lines 59-63 and column 6, lines 43-49) is not equivalent to assigning source data colors to specific colors as recited in claim 6. This is an additional reason as to why claim 6 is allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 8. Sansone's disclosure of a program that compute and store "simulated" bar and space widths (Sansone, column 8, lines 5-6) is not equivalent to outputting a file containing the logo data, a printer registration command for storing the logo data in the at least one target printer, and a data transmission command for sending the printer registration command and logo data to the at least one target printer as recited in claim 8. This is an additional reason as to why claim 8 is allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 9. Sansone's disclosure of a program that compute and store "simulated" bar and space widths (Sansone, column 8, lines 5-6) is not equivalent to sending the logo data and a command that causes the at least one target printer to store the logo data therein as recited in claim 9. This is an additional reason as to why claim 9 is allowable over the prior art.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's rejection of claim 12. The only mention that Sansone makes of a display is in reference to displaying a print quality notice (Sansone, column 7, lines 27-30) which is not equivalent to displaying an image based on the source data and an image based on the logo data

as recited in claim 12. This is an additional reason as to why claim 12 is allowable over the prior art.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 13 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sansone in view of U.S. patent application publication number 2002/0077892 filed by Bryan R. GORING (hereinafter Goring).

Claims 13 recites display the images (source data image and the logo data image) aligned for comparison on one side of the display.

Neither Sansone nor Goring suggest or disclose displaying anything resembling a source data image or a logo data image. Nor do they suggest or disclose displaying any images aligned for comparison. Sansone's only mention of a display is the display of a user print quality notice (Sansone, column 7, lines 29-30). While Goring only mention is develop the images with an image design application such as Microsoft Paint, which does not provide the features recited in claim 13. For at least this reason claim 13 is allowable over the cited art.

In paragraph [0012] Goring discloses a system for printing a coupon or receipt which includes a printed image. The system includes a workstation that is capable of connecting to a network. Connected to the workstation is a printer. Loaded on the workstation is software that is configured to download image information from a remote location, and convert an image associated with the image information into a pixel matrix representation. The printer is configured to print at least one scan line by selectively printing pixels corresponding to the pixel matrix representation.

Converting image information into a pixel matrix representation as disclosed by Goring is not equivalent to processing the source data based on the model specific data as recited in the claims.

The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assessment of the combinability of Sansone and Goring. Sansone is directed towards pixel splitting to improve bar code readability. There is no mention of ads or advertising as suggested by the examiner, Sansone does disclose a coupon, but makes no mention of advertising on the coupon, nor is the coupon disclosed used in the context of an

advertisement or voucher but as a payment form. For at least this reason Goring and Sansone are not combinable as suggested by the examiner.

Furthermore, Goring does not suggest or disclose storing the images in the printer; instead Goring is directed towards a kiosk, which stores a variety of images, any of which can be printed by an attached printer. If a single image was stored on the printer this would run counter to the goal of Goring which is to allow one of a plurality of images to be printed depending on the circumstances. For at least this reason Goring should not be used in the manner suggested by the examiner.

Claim 26 is allowable over the cited art for at least the same reason as claim 1. The examiner has indicated that Sansone fails to expressly disclose a display unit for reading and displaying the printer model name, number of printable colors and present resolution stored in memory. The examiner has indicated his belief that paragraphs [0013-0019] of Goring disclose this feature. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assertion that these 6 paragraphs disclose the feature recited in claim 26.

Paragraph [0013] of Goring discusses the capability to print images.

Paragraph [0014] of Goring discusses how an image may be provided through the Internet to a workstation and the images may be developed through an image design application.

Paragraph [0015] of Goring discusses how the image and information associated with the file may be stored, including information on the placement of the image on a customer receipt. Please note that Goring lists several methods of storing images but does not suggest or disclose storing images in the printer.

Paragraph [0016] of Goring discloses a kiosk that includes a display but this display and printer integrated with or adjunct to the kiosk. Goring does not suggest or disclose using the display for displaying the printer model name, number of printable colors and print resolution.

Paragraph [0017] of Goring discloses a kiosk, which can download images linked to services supported by the kiosk. The kiosk may download images in real time or periodically. Thus it is implied that the images may be stored in the kiosk but there is no mention of storing the images on the printer.

Paragraph [0018] of Goring discusses how once a consumer performs a supported service, the kiosk then produces a receipt with an included graphic. The placement of the graphic may be known by the kiosk or may be specified by the service provider.

Paragraph [0019] of Goring discusses how a coupon produced by the kiosk may also include information that might include information about the transaction performed by the kiosk, which may be used once the coupon has been redeemed to assess the effectiveness of a marketing campaign.

Thus Goring does not disclose the feature that the examiner indicated was missing for Sansone. This is an additional reason as to why Claim 26 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 27-29 are allowable at least because they are dependent upon an allowable base claim.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel A. Ratoff/  
Daniel A. Ratoff  
Registration No. 54,389

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Phone: (408) 952-6030  
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058  
Customer No. 20178

Date: October 18, 2006